

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/514,999

Applicant(s)

Tanimoto et al.

Examiner

Irene Marx

Group Art Unit

1651



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Irene Marx

(3) _____

(2) Mr. Arai

(4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 18, 2002Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The proposed amendment was discussed. It was indicated that the amendment from polyamine composition to "polyamines" would raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration. It was pointed out that "said digested/hydrolyzed components lacks proper antecedent basis. Also the "two times" should be followed by a clause indicating the process compared regarding the doubling. A continuation may be filed..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

IRENE MARX
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1651

Louis J. Knobbe*
Don W. Martens*
Gordon H. Olson*
James B. Bear
Darrall L. Olson*
William B. Bunker
William M. Nienan
Arthur S. Rose
James F. Lesniak
Ned A. Iversen
Drew S. Hamilton
Jerry T. Sewell
John B. Sganga, Jr.
Edward A. Schlatter
Gerard von Hoffmann
Joseph R. Re
Catherine J. Holland
John M. Carson
Karen Vogel Weil
Andrew M. Simpson
Jeffrey L. Van Hoosear
Daniel E. Altman
Marguerite L. Gunn
Stephen C. Jensen
Vito A. Canuso III
William H. Shreve
Lynda J. Zadra-Symest
Steven J. Matzapsky
Paul A. Stewart
Joseph F. Jennings
Craig S. Summers
Annelmarie Kasper
Brenton R. Babcock
Thomas F. Smegat, Jr.
Michael H. Trenholm
Diane M. Reed
Ronald J. Schoenbaum
John R. King
Frederick S. Beretta
Nancy W. Vensko

John P. Giezantner
Adele S. Ahlhar
Ginger R. Dreger
Thomas R. Arac
David N. Weiss
Daniel Hart, Ph.D.
Douglas G. Muehlhauser
Lori Lee Yamato
Michael N. Friedland
Oale C. Hunt, Ph.D.
Richard E. Campbell
Stephen M. Lobbin
Stacey R. Halpern
Lee W. Henderson, Ph.D.
Deborah S. Shepherd
Mark M. Abumari
Jon W. Gurka
Eric M. Nelson
Mark R. Benedict, Ph.D.
Paul H. Conover
Robert J. Roby
Sabine M. Lee
Karlina A. Delaney
John W. Hotcomb
James J. Mullen III, Ph.D.
Joseph S. Cianfrani
Joseph M. Reisman, Ph.D.
William R. Zimmerman
Glen L. Nuttall
Eric S. Farman, Ph.D.
Tizah Ade Lowe
Geoffrey Y. Uda
Alexander Franco
Sanjivpat S. Gill
Susan M. Moss
James W. Mu, M.D.
Rose M. Thiesen, Ph.D.
Michael L. Feller
Michael A. Gulliana
Mark J. Kertz

Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP

Intellectual Property Law

620 Newport Center Drive
Sidebenth Floor
Newport Beach CA 92660

Tel 949-760-0404
Fax 949-760-9502
knob.com

Rabinder N. Marfa
Bruce S. Bobkowitz, Ph.D.
Peter M. Midgley
Thomas S. McClenathan
Michael S. Okamoto
John M. Grover
Mallory K. De Merlier
Brian A. Latief
Amy C. Christensen
Sharon S. Ng
Mark J. Gallagher, Ph.D.
David G. Jankowski, Ph.D.
Brian C. Horne
Payson J. LeMelleur
Diana W. Prince
William C. Bollig
Shelia N. Swaroop
Ben A. Kalzone-Henbogen
Chanelle Lee Armstrong
Linda M. Lie
Vincent M. Peltmeyer
Jeffrey S. Ellsworth
Andrew N. Merickel, Ph.D.
Douglas T. Hudson
David L. Hauser
Karee D. Larson
James F. Markenhoff
Scott L. Murray
C. Philip Poirier
Roger S. Shang
Andrew M. Douglas
Marc T. Morley
Salma A. Merani, Ph.D.
Tina M. Chappell
Sam K. Fahmassobi, Ph.D.
Jalel Sadr
Jonathan A. Hyman
Curtiss C. Dosier

Of Counsel
Jerry R. Selter
Paul C. Steinhardt

Japanese Patent Atty
Katsuhiko Arai

European Patent Atty
Martin Hellebrandt

Korean Patent Atty
Mincheol Kim
Heungsoo Choi

Solicitor (England & Wales)
J. David Evered

Scientists & Engineers
(Non-Lawyers)

Raimond J. Salenicks**
Jeffrey Koepke, Ph.D.**
Khuram Rahman, Ph.D.
Jennifer A. Haynes, Ph.D.
Brendan P. O'Neill, Ph.D.
Tommy Y. Nagata
Megumi Tanaka
Che S. Cherskin, Ph.D.**
Erik W. Archbold
Philip C. Hartstein
Julia A. Hopper
Chris S. Castle
James W. Ausley
R'Sue P. Caron, Ph.D.
Jennifer Hayes
Kirk E. Pastorian, Ph.D.
Charles T. Ridgely
Keith R. McCollum
Johnlar F. Kerlee
Bonny Young, Ph.D.
Connie C. Tong, Ph.D.
Suzanne G. Jepson, Ph.D.
David K. Wiggins
Megan M. McCoy
Nira M. Brand
Catherine M. Sanders
Iman Bakht
Thomas E. Vesbit
Jeffrey A. Hopkins

* A Professional Corporation
† Also Barrister At Law (UK & Wales)
** U.S. Patent Agent

ORIGINAL WILL FOLLOW VIA:

- ☐ MAIL
- ☐ INTERNATIONAL AIRMAIL
- ☐ COURIER
- ☒ WILL NOT FOLLOW
- ☐ HAND DELIVERY
- ☐ WITH ENCLOSURES
- ☐ WITHOUT ENCLOSURES

Facsimile Transmittal Sheet

Confidentiality Notice:

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain confidential information which may be legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the recipient named below. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone to arrange for return of the original documents to us; and any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this faxed information is strictly prohibited.

TO: Examiner Irene Marx 1651
FIRM: USPTO
FACSIMILE
TELEPHONE NO.: (1) 703 308-0294 4242
FROM: Katsu Arai
OUR REFERENCE NO.: KODA-20A-001, this
YOUR REFERENCE NO.: application No. 09/514,999
TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: (INCLUDING COVER SHEET) 3
OPERATOR:

DATE: 4/11/02

TIME:

IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL BACK IMMEDIATELY.

Facsimile Operator Phone Number: (949) 760-0404

Direct Line to Machine: (949) 760-9502

MESSAGE: this is for a telephone interview scheduled for 10:30 am on 4/16.

FAX RECEIVED

APR 12 2002

GROUP 1600

OFFICIAL

305 West C Street
Suite 1200
San Diego CA 92101
Tel 619-235-8530
Fax 619-235-0176

201 California Street
Suite 1150
San Francisco CA 94111
Tel 415-954-4116
Fax 415-954-4111

1900 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 1425
Los Angeles CA 90067
Tel 310-531-3430
Fax 310-531-3434

3801 University Avenue
Suite 710
Riverside CA 92501
Tel 909-781-9231
Fax 909-781-4507

P.1/3 NO.672

KNOBBE MARTENS

APR. 11. 2002 10:51AM

RCE

Serial No. 09/514,999
Art Unit 1651

Claim Amendment:

9 (Amended) A method of ~~manufacturing a~~ obtaining polyamines ~~composition~~, comprising the steps of:

providing yeast somatic components selected from the group consisting of extracts obtained from yeast by physical crushing, ~~or~~ extracts obtained from yeast by autolysis, ~~or~~ extracts obtained from yeast with hot water, and yeast RNA compositions;

subjecting said yeast somatic components to nuclease digestion ~~or~~ alkali hydrolysis as a decomposition step to decompose a high molecular weight substance bound with polyamine wherein for a time period effective to increase a yield of polyamines recovered in a subsequent recovery step the amount of polyamine dissociated from said yeast somatic components is by approximately double two times or more; and

recovering polyamines from said digested/hydrolyzed components.

Re: 112 ¶1 Rejection

1. "approximately double or more": Examples 1, 2, and 3 show an increase by 3, 2.1, and 3.2 times, respectively, as compared with respective Comparative Examples 1, 2, and 3, wherein the only difference between the Examples and the Comparative Examples is omitting the decomposition step of Claim 9. The degree of purification of the starting material is not in issue.
2. Infinite upper limit: The upper limit is not important, and one of ordinary skill in the art can readily practice the claimed invention without an indication of the upper limit.
3. The comparison: It is clear that compared is a method without the decomposition step. No.

Re: 112 ¶2 Rejection

1. "a high molecular weight substance": Deleted.
2. "recovering polyamine": Polyamine is changed to polyamines (including more than one polyamine). Further, the preamble is changed to "obtaining polyamines".

Re: 103 Rejection

1. Polyamines are aliphatic hydrocarbon, not peptides or amino acids. Tanekawa teaches a process of producing a yeast extract containing GMP (guanosine-5'-monophosphate). The objective is obtaining flavoring agents. The other references except for Sato are the same as Tanekawa in this respect and are irrelevant to the recovery of polyamines.
2. Further, Tanekawa hydrolyzes yeast cells using alkali, but this is for obtaining a yeast extract (i.e., yeast somatic components). In Tanekawa, the yeast extract is not subjected to alkali hydrolysis, but to enzymatic hydrolysis to increase GMP (column 5, line 62 through column 6, line 17).
3. Sato teaches recovery of polyamine. Sato discloses treatment with a sodium hydroxide solution for neutralization purposes. This is clearly different from the decomposition step by alkali hydrolysis to significantly increase a yield of polyamines.
4. In conclusion, none of the references suggests that the decomposition step by nuclease digestion or alkali hydrolysis significantly increase a yield of polyamine.

\\DOCS_NB\FILES\DOCS\KOA\KOA-2422.DOC
040902